

Appl. No. 10/604,722
Amdt. dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 12, 2005

REMARKS

1. Amendments to claims 1 and 9 and introduction of claims 20-21:

- 5 Independent claim 1 is amended to include the limitation that the opening of the reflective housing has "a diameter smaller than a maximum diameter of the reflective housing". This amendment is based on the applicant's Figs. 6 and 7, which show the reduced diameter of the opening of the reflective housing
- 10 74 (narrow end of truncated cone immediately adjacent to invisible-light reflector 78). No new matter is entered.

Claims 2 and 8 are amended for consistency.

- 15 Independent claim 9 and dependent 19 are similarly amended. No new matter is entered.

- Independent claim 20 is introduced and is a combination of previously presented claim 1 and the "parabolic reflective housing" limitation of claim 8. Claim 21 includes the other
- 20 limitations of claim 8. No new matter is entered.

Consideration of all amendments is respectfully requested.

- 25 2. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Lemke (US 5,615,938):

Regarding amended claim 1,

Appl. No. 10/604,722
Amdt. dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 12, 2005

Lemke does not teach or suggest a reflective housing having "an opening having a diameter smaller than a maximum diameter of the reflective housing" as recited in amended claim 1.

- 5 The corresponding openings shown in all figures of Lemke have a diameter the same as the maximum diameter of the reflector 4.

This is not a trivial difference, since the reduced-diameter opening can increase the inner space within the reflective
10 housing to better distribute heat, for instance.

Regarding claim 8 and new claims 20-21,

- Lemke does not teach or suggest a parabolic reflector. Lemke does
15 not expressly describe the shape of the reflector 4, however, all the figures illustrate a non-parabolic shape.

Moreover, since Lemke is obviously concerned with focusing the light from lamp 3 onto light guide 7 (col. 4, lines 10-13), a
20 parabolic reflector is not suggested nor even reasonable. This is because a parabolic reflector would tend to make light straight or parallel rather than converge it onto the condenser lens 6 and subsequent light guide 7. That is, one of ordinary skill in the art would not chose a reflector 4 having a parabolic shape
25 since it would substantially reduce the light reaching the light guide 7.

Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, and 18 is requested in view of the amendment to claim 1. Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, and 18 are

Appl. No. 10/604,722
Amdt. dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 12, 2005

dependent and should be allowed if the corresponding independent claim is allowed.

3. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-14, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C.
5 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aritake et al. (US 6,478,429)
in view of Lemke:

Regarding amended claims 1 and 9,

- 10 The combination does not include a reflective housing having "an opening having a diameter smaller than a maximum diameter of the reflective housing" as recited in amended claims 1 and 9.

Regarding claim 8 and new claims 20-21,

- 15 As mentioned above, the applicant argues that a parabolic reflector is incompatible with Lemke's device. Therefore, since Lemke does not teach or suggest any embodiment with a parabolic reflector, then one of ordinary skill in the art would not
20 necessarily understand it to be obvious to tilt the invisible-light reflector 37 in parabolic-reflector embodiments of Aritake. Further, detailed optical analysis would have to be preformed, and in the applicant's contention, this would be similar in scope to an inventive process.

- 25 Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-14, 17, and 18 is requested in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 9. Claims 2, 4-8, 11-14, 17, and 18 are dependent and should be allowed if the corresponding independent claim is allowed.

Appl. No. 10/604,722
Amdt. dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

5 Winston Hsu

Date: April 11, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

10 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk
to me. The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e.
9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan).

15